

MINUTES  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF YORK

Adjourned Meeting  
October 24, 2000

6:30 p.m.

Meeting Convened. An Adjourned Meeting of the York County Board of Supervisors was called to order at 6:31 p.m., Tuesday, October 24, 2000, in the East Room, York Hall, by Vice Chairman James S. Burgett.

Attendance. The following members of the Board of Supervisors were present: Donald E. Wiggins, James S. Burgett, and Melanie L. Rapp.

Walter C. Zaremba and Sheila S. Noll were absent.

Also in attendance were Daniel M. Stuck, County Administrator; and James E. Barnett, County Attorney.

**WORK SESSION**

DARE MARINA EXPANSION (Not on Agenda)

Mr. Burgett noted there were several people in attendance this evening because of their interest in the plans for the Dare Marina expansion. He stated the Board has added that topic to its work session scheduled for November 15, and the staff will be prepared at that time to provide information and answer any questions. He indicated the Board members were getting a lot of phone calls concerning the proposed expansion, and they are very aware of the problem. Mr. Burgett also noted that the Board had received a petition from over 170 citizens requesting that the application for the site plan approval be placed on hold until the affected property owners have an opportunity to be heard and zoning code compliance issues are fully resolved.

Chairman Zaremba arrived at 6:34 p.m.

Mr. Wiggins noted the application affects the citizens in Districts 3 and 4 along Chisman Creek. The sound from the marina is the concern for District 3, and the traffic is also a concern for District 4. He stated many people have a lot of questions as to whether or not what Dare Marina wants to do can be done legally. The citizens want to know if the marina is within its rights with regard to the expansion, and if the County making sure that it was being done according to all pertinent regulations.

Chairman Zaremba stated the Board will be briefed on the project on November 15, and nothing concerning the application will be approved before that time. He apologized to those individuals appearing at tonight's meeting thinking it was to be on tonight's agenda.

**TRANSPORTATION ISSUES**

Up-River Crossing Study

Mr. Stuck indicated staff would be covering the Secondary Road Program, the Primary Road Program, a summary of the County's Revenue Sharing Program, the Dirt Street Program, and the Fort Eustis Boulevard extension and widening. He stated a consultant would also provide a briefing on the analysis completed on the potential for constructing an up-river crossing of the York River.

Mr. Jun Villoria, project manager for the York River Crossing Travel Demand Study done by TranCore, gave a summary briefing of the project covering the objectives and approach taken for the project, tasks undertaken, highlights of the study results, and findings. He noted the objective of the project was to determine if there was a demand for an upriver crossing. He explained the approach taken in analyzing the need for such a crossing, comparing actual 1999 crossing figures for the current York River Bridge to estimates made with a new crossing through the year 2045. Mr. Villoria then explained the cost scenarios for the north and south alternatives that indicated a funding requirement of \$294,000,000 to \$537,000,000. He stated without a new crossing, the forecast traffic volume on the Coleman Bridge will reach its four-lane capacity by the year 2014. If the Coleman was reconfigured for six lanes, it would reach capacity in 2033.

Chairman Zaremba asked what the cost would be for six-laning the Coleman Bridge.

Mr. Horace Welch, representing VDOT, indicated that when the bridge was widened, it was constructed to accommodate six lanes. There would only be some minor work needed, but mostly just striping.

Chairman Zaremba asked if the widening project extended on the Gloucester side.

Mr. Welch indicated it did not.

Chairman Zaremba asked if there were any future plans for widening the Gloucester side.

Mr. Welch stated the 2018/2020 Plan included funding for widening Route 17 in Gloucester, but only \$2 million has been set aside for that project.

Mr. Wiggins noted the problem was that the real need in York County was for Route 17 to be widened south of Fort Eustis Boulevard and not north of it.

Mr. Welch stated VDOT was aware of that, but there was a shortfall of funding at this time. He stated VDOT was in the process of doing a new six-year program, and the widening was included in the plan. The only question was whether or not it would get funded.

Mr. Wiggins stated the Board was concerned about the fact that the four lanes handle the traffic adequately from the Coleman Bridge to Fort Eustis Boulevard. He indicated the Board can't understand why the money VDOT plans to use to widen that portion of Route 17 can't be allocated to widening the southern portion.

Mr. Welch stated he felt some discussion had taken place on that topic, and VDOT was going to work with the County on doing just that.

Discussion followed regarding the concerns of Gloucester County on the need for an up-river crossing versus six-laning Route 17 north of the York River Bridge.

Mr. Stuck asked if an analysis was done of Route 17 south of Fort Eustis Boulevard.

Mr. Welch indicated it was not a part of the study.

Mr. Stuck stated that years ago when York County supported an up-river crossing rather than widening the Coleman, Gloucester County also supported the up-river crossing. Once the decision was made to widen the bridge, the legislators were active in obtaining funds to do something between the bridge and Fort Eustis Boulevard and I-64, and the Alternate 5 crossing plan was kept on the table. Mr. Stuck stated it was his understanding that VDOT would now be asking the Board to accept this study which allows them to complete their contract. Information of value to York County is not contained in this study which is the impact south on Route 17 from Fort Eustis Boulevard. He stated staff had received a copy of the study several weeks ago, and VDOT was requested to come and brief the Board on it. He noted he had talked with Gloucester County, but did not know what its final position will be. The bottom line was that \$3.2 billion has been identified to meet needs statewide, and there is little chance of finding one-half billion to build another bridge.

Mr. Villoria concluded his briefing stating the 2018 forecast was that necessary improvements can be made to Route 17 without having to construct a new bridge. The study recommends that enhancements be made to Route 17 and eventually operate the Coleman Bridge at a six-lane capacity.

Discussion followed concerning the unpaid balance on the Coleman Bridge debt and the cost to six-lane Route 17 from the bridge south to the Newport News City line.

#### Secondary Road Six-Year Plan

Mr. Robert Baldwin, Chief Planner, distributed to the Board members the six-year plan submittal from last year showing the existing plan. He indicated staff would assume all the projects stay in the plan unless otherwise directed by the Board. He indicated staff recommended the addition of a safety project for Newman Road to this year's plan.

Mr. Quintin Elliott, Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Transportation, explained the funding allocation process, indicating there were some things that were different in how VDOT was doing funding because of the new Transportation Act of 2000. He stated there would be some changes in next year's funding (decrease). He stated he had been instructed, because project costs were exceeding estimates, to add an inflation factor; and this will change some of the costs of the projects in the current plan and could have an impact on the ad dates and getting the projects through the program to completion. He addressed the proposal for the Newman Road safety project, stating it has a very bad curve and high embankment which needs to be straightened out with an estimated cost of about \$2 million.

Mr. Stuck stated the Newman Road project was on the six-year plan to be widened at one point, but he recommended that, because of the cost and timing of the project, and because the traffic volumes on the road were very low, the money should be spent elsewhere. He noted that a safety project was left in the program, and that safety project was now costing almost as much as the original project. He stated there were transportation issues all over the County, but there was a limited amount of money to spent on them. Such a project would take about 4-5 years of financing to get it to construction.

October 24, 2000

Discussion followed concerning other projects contained in the Six-Year Plan and the use of a regional mix of funds for regional projects. Also discussed was the status of the Big Bethel Road/Victory Boulevard intersection project.

Mr. Elliott asked the Board to let him know as soon as possible if there were any other projects the County wanted added to the Plan because it would be presented to the Board in December.

Mr. Stuck indicated that staff was looking at development patterns in the County and the developable land available. This information will be compared to the road plan and traffic counts, and an evaluation will be made of whether or not the County was addressing the correct projects. He stated this information would be made available to the Board next November for consideration with the Six-Year Plan in the 2001 round of review.

#### Six-Year Plan for Primary Roads

Mr. Baldwin distributed to the Board members the current project listing for major roadways. He indicated the Board would be approving the plan for primary roads in the February/March timeframe for the spring Commonwealth Transportation Board hearings. He asked that the Board members review the plan to see if the projects still had the same priorities as last year.

Discussion followed on the project to six-lane Route 171 between Routes 134 and 17 and the costs for the I-64 project.

Mr. Stuck indicated the County was not having a lot of success getting projects into the VDOT plan.

Mr. Baldwin noted the Fort Eustis Boulevard Extension project has been through the VDOT location public hearing. The next step was to proceed to the final design stage and then on to public hearing, right-of-way acquisition, and construction. He estimated a construction date of 2003.

Chairman Zaremba asked how VDOT worked through the environmental issues.

Mr. Elliott stated many are taken care of during the location study. Some mitigation still has to be done, but many of the environmental hurdles have been overcome.

Chairman Zaremba asked who had oversight for the environmental concerns.

Mr. Elliott indicated VDOT does the actual mitigation project which was a part of the construction project, but a number of federal and state agencies must give approval.

Discussion followed on the new alignment for the Fort Eustis Boulevard extension project.

Mr. Baldwin then noted staff had met with Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Elliott this afternoon to discuss the need for widening Route 17 south of Fort Eustis Boulevard. He stated a compromise had been reached, at least in concept, to widen Route 17 from Fort Eustis Boulevard north to York High School and tapering down to four lanes up to the Park Service property. He stated the remaining money would be used for potential projects on the south end of Route 17 to improve traffic flow. Mr. Baldwin stated there would be about \$8 million to apply to sections of Route 17 south of Fort Eustis Boulevard.

Mr. Burgett indicated that was good news, and he asked if there was a plan for a direct access to Fort Eustis Boulevard from I-64.

Mr. Elliott stated the interchange design was a part of the I-64 widening project. Because of the location, it would be hard to make a direct connection; but an urban interchange was being considered.

Miss Rapp asked how far would the money go for improvements on Route 17 south of Fort Eustis Boulevard.

Mr. Stuck stated at the meeting today with Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Elliott it was agreed that the District would send the County a letter memorializing the discussions and asking the Board what it wanted to do. He stated it would be up to staff to make recommendations to the Board in terms of what to ask VDOT to consider. He noted that \$8 million wouldn't go far, but staff would be looking at what it could do to maximize improvements to traffic flow.

#### Revenue Sharing Program

Mr. Baldwin provided a status report of the County's Revenue Sharing Program from 1991 to the present. He stated the floor was open for suggestions in terms of projects to recommend for next year, and he spoke of how the money had been used in the past.

Chairman Zaremba questioned how the Shoreline Stabilization Project was done with Revenue Sharing funds.

Mr. Stuck indicated that some of the work was in such close proximity to the road that VDOT provided funding as a road protection measure.

Chairman Zaremba asked what it meant that it was supplemented from the Fort Eustis Boulevard project.

Mr. Stuck explained that the County received more STP funds than it had expected, and the excess was placed in this project, thus allowing some of the Revenue Sharing Program funding to be shifted to other projects.

#### Dirt Street Program

Mr. Bob Peters, Chief of Engineering and Facility Maintenance, made a presentation providing the Board with background information on the Dirt Street Program and the process of upgrading dirt streets to meet VDOT standards in order for VDOT to accept the streets into its state system of highways. He discussed the two active projects, Russell Lane and Kay Lane, noting the cost for both was \$154,222. He then discussed the top five projects currently on the active priority list.

Discussion followed on prioritization of the program's projects.

Mr. Peters then outlined the five-step program:

October 24, 2000

Notification and requests for response as to interest

Acquisition of rights-of-way and easements

Design of the project

Preparation of documentation for Board of Supervisors approval

Actual construction

Mr. Elliott noted the funding came from the Secondary Six-Year Program.

Meeting Recessed. At 8:35 p.m. Chairman Zaremba declared a short recess.

Meeting Reconvened. At 8:45 p.m. the meeting was reconvened in open session by order of the Chair.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 2001

Mr. Barnett indicated the Board had received his memorandum with attachments concerning a proposed Legislative Program for 2001 which included a copy of last year's program and submittals from Board members and Department Directors with items for the Board's consideration. He then distributed two additional items for consideration, one from the City of Williamsburg containing its legislative program, and the other a list of proposed funding requests to the state for increased funding for the Yorktown Waterfront projects.

Mr. Robert S. Kraus, Director of General Services, reviewed the three projects that he felt might get some funding from the General Assembly:

Shoreline Erosion Protection and Beach Restoration: Request an appropriation that will earmark state funding in the amount of \$900,000 for shoreline erosion protection and beach restoration in Historic Yorktown.

Riverwalk Connection for the Yorktown Victory Center: Request special funding in the amount of \$150,000 to construct the Riverwalk to connect the Yorktown waterfront to the Yorktown Victory Center.

New Pier: Request state funding for the construction of a new pier to promote tourism and to support the 2007 celebration of Jamestown at an estimated cost of \$2.8 million.

Mr. Barnett indicated the package provided to the Board members tonight was for information only at this time. He stated he needed to get a final indication from the Board as to what it feels are the priority items to present to the legislators for their consideration. The legislators are required to submit bills by December 16 which is earlier than years prior. After the General Assembly is in session, they are limited to five additional bills. Mr. Barnett then reviewed last year's program and the breakdown of specific legislation submitted by the County, with note of any action taken by the General Assembly, and a statement of legislative policies to pursue.

Discussion on the County's past record with the General Assembly regarding requested legislation.

Mr. Stuck suggested that the Board retain the format used last year and consider the following proposals submitted for requested legislation:

- Increase transportation Revenue Sharing Program funding
- Request for an Enterprise Zone
- Request use of sliding scale for meeting pump-out requirement of septic tanks every five years
- Delete the requirement for a Board of Supervisors member to serve on the Community Criminal Justice Board
- Request appropriations for Yorktown projects
- Oppose Building Code amendment to preclude zoning authority regarding certain design aspects.

With regard to the policy statements, Mr. Stuck stated he felt the current ones were excellent, but suggested that transportation and education funding be separated and listed as two separate items.

Discussion followed on Mr. Stuck's suggestions.

By consensus the Board directed the County Attorney to draft a legislative program for 2001 for the November 15 work session based on recommendations made by the County Administrator, with the addition of any items that may be identified before that time by the Board members.

#### BUDGET HISTORY BRIEFING—SOCIAL SERVICES (Not on Agenda)

Mr. James O. McReynolds, Director of Financial and Management Services, made a presentation on general fund expenditures regarding the Social Services Department since FY89. He noted the change was nearly a 100 percent increase over the 12-year period. The Federal/State governments have maintained their funding percentages during the same period. Factors driving the increase include cost increases that are higher than inflation, and there is more demand for services as well as more state mandates.

Mr. Burgett asked what percentage of York's population was receiving Social Services.

Mr. McReynolds indicated he did not have that information at this time, but he would get it and provide it to the Board members. He then continued his presentation regarding the factors impacting the increase.

Chairman Zaremba asked how the poverty level was defined.

Mr. McReynolds indicated it depended on the factors of income and family size.

October 24, 2000

Chairman Zaremba asked how the 2,700 people below the poverty level were identified.

Mr. McReynolds stated they were identified through income statistics provided by the federal government and the Census Bureau.

Discussion followed on the forecast for continuing cost increases in Social Services.

Meeting Adjourned. At 9:28 p.m. Chairman Zaremba declared the meeting adjourned to 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, November 15, 2000, in the East Room, York Hall, for the purpose of conducting a work session.

---

Daniel M. Stuck, Clerk  
York County Board of Supervisors

---

Walter C. Zaremba, Chairman  
York County Board of Supervisors